GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

JULY 6, 2006

+ + + + +

The Special Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 5:30 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Vice-Chairperson presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice-Chairperson

GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner

JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS)
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

ELLEN McCARTHY
JENNIFER STEINGASSER
JOEL LAWSON
TRAVIS PARKER

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ.

I									2
							tutes the		
	from	the	Special	Public	Meeti:	ng held	l on July	6, 200	16.

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER: Anthony J. Hood	4
CASE NO. 06-22	4
VOTE TO DENY RELIEF:	10
RELIEF FROM 1606.7 PROPOSAL (JUNE)	10
VOTE TO APPROVE RELIEF	11
VOTE TO APPROVE MAY 3 PLAN FOR SOUTH PLAZA .	20
RELIEF FROM 1606.14d HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS VOTE TO APPROVE RELIEF	21 29
RELIEF FROM 1601.14e DEPTH RESTRICTIONS VOTE TO APPROVE OPTION 2	29 37
RELIEF FROM 1601.16 PEDESTRIAN RAMP	38 48
MOU	50
MOTION TO APPROVE TWO NAMING RIGHTS SIGNS VOTE TO APPROVE TWO SIGNS	71 75
MOTION FOR GREEN ROOFS	76 79
MOTION TO URGE APPLICANT TO INCLUDE GREEN ROOFS	79 80
MOTION TO ENCOURAGE APPLICANT TO WORK WITH OFFICE OF PLANNING AND DDOT ON ISSUES	82 82
ADJOURN: Anthony J. Hood	85

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	5:36 p.m.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening,
4	ladies and gentlemen. This is a Special Public
5	Meeting of the District Zoning Commission on Thursday,
6	July 6, 2006 at 5:44.
7	Joining me for the Special Public Meeting
8	are Commissioners Jeffries, Parsons and Turnbull.
9	Let me ask first does the staff have any
LO	preliminary matters.
L1	MRS. SCHELLIN: No sir.
L2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I will ask
L3	everyone's indulgence. There's a lot of information
L4	that's come into the record that we requested. We're
L5	going to try to go through this as thoroughly as
L6	possible.
L7	Colleagues, the relief sought, I'm just
L8	going to run through this and if I miss anything
L9	please let me know. The requirement is relief from
20	1606.7, 1606.14D, 1606.14E, 1606.16. Does anyone
21	have anything to add? I think we've captured
22	okay.
23	So what I'd like to do first is to discuss
24	1606.7, the requirement is all parking spaces within
25	the ballpark site shall be provided underground. The

relief requested, we have and I don't want to call them options but we have two alternatives in front of us.

One is two structures above ground, 925 above-ground parking spaces in two above-ground structures. And the second, well let's deal with the first one unless someone wants to proceed in another fashion. I'll open it up.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just make some preliminary remarks. The problem with the relief sought all the way down that you just cited is we're presented with options. And in my view most of the options that are provided are superior, not only from a design standpoint but a land use standpoint.

And at the same time we're asked to approve a lesser project or alternative because of something I don't understand, and I don't know that it's our place to understand, the economics of things, the permitting of things and, as land use body, I think it's our role to advise the decision makers in other forums what we feel. And it's clear to me that temporary parking above ground, if it is temporary, is the wrong way to go as opposed to the alternative that was brought forward, so I think we should be sending

1 a signal back that we just deny the parking structure 2 as presented to us in May and select the preferred 3 alternative that we saw last week. So that's my view 4 on this aspect of it. 5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me make sure I understand. 6 When we open it up for 7 discussion I want to make sure I have a process on how 8 we're going to do it. I was planning on dealing with 9 one then moving to the next, but I guess if you want to we can open them up and discuss both in that 10 11 fashion. 12 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, yes, I think it's two separate actions but I just want to let you 13 14 know where I was going. 15 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. 16 Anyone else want to comment? 17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would just echo Mr. Parsons' summation of where we are on those two 18 19 I would agree with him. issues. 20 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And I would also 21 agree with Commissioner Parsons. We are purely and 22 simply a land use regulatory body and, of course, 23 there are a number of items that are floating around 24 as relates to Council and cost control and opening day 25 and things of that sort but I think in terms of what's

been put before us here, I am certainly not willing to 1 2 go the dual approval route. 3 So therefore the part of the approval that 4 would ask us to, you know, fall back to the above 5 ground structures that are not encased with retail, residential and hotel, I would not be in favor of. 6 7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm just 8 trying to frame this discussion and maybe I've gotten 9 confused so I'm going to try it another way. The proposal that came to us May 3rd, as 10 11 Mr. Parsons alluded to, which was the 925 above ground 12 parking spaces in those two structures. The way I wanted to move, and maybe we're moving that way, maybe 13 14 it's just I'm а slow learner and T'm not. 15 understanding, but I would like for us to deal with that and then whether or not we want to move to the 16 17 alternative and let's discuss that. Because I think 18 we're combining them. 19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, let me try 20 it this way. I move that we deny the above ground 21 parking structures. 22 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'll second. 23 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Is that what you 24 wanted? 25 I thought we were VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD:

1 going to deliberate, I didn't want it that quick. 2 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, you know, if 3 we get a motion on the floor and then we can talk 4 about it. 5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I didn't even ask Okay, it's been moved and seconded. 6 for a second. 7 And me just say discussion? No further discussion? 8 9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just think that 10 we would be remiss in approving above ground garages 11 in a part of the city that's under development. 12 mean here we're looking for redevelopment of an area and going back to exposed garage without any retail 13 14 around it does not do anything for what the community 15 wants to be. think, 16 don't as Mr. Parsons 17 earlier, it's a good land use, it's not good planning, it's not good for the development of the city. 18 19 just think it's something we shouldn't even consider. 20 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, you know, 21 it's not a compelling argument the way I see it as it 22 relates to this whole notion about April 2008. 23 date's going to come and go and we're going to be left 24 with, if we were, this Commission, to go forward with 25 second proposal, the May proposal,

there'll be a lot of regret to pony up and move under duress for this opening day. I just don't think it's in keeping with what this Commission is all about as it relates to land use.

Again, we're a one-trick pony up here, that's what we do, land use, and I think in terms of what's been put before us, at least for the above ground parking, is just not acceptable.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would agree with my colleagues but, you know, when this was first given to us and I would say that this area is going to jumpstart and I'm sure that this mechanism is going to trigger what's going to happen down there, but it took me back to when we did the tech hotels. I know Mr. Parsons, I'm sure you remember the tech hotels and how those were being built to how the electronics and stuff for the time, but at a later time they would come back to be able to use for retail use and that's what I was kind of thinking in terms of this. seems like we're not going in that direction so it's been moved and properly seconded and this is to vote on the 925 above ground parking spaces in two above ground structures. All those in favor?

(Ayes)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposition?

1	Staff, would you record the vote?
2	MRS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record
3	the vote $4-0-1$ to deny the above ground parking
4	structures. Commissioner Parsons moving, Commissioner
5	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Jeffries and Hood in
6	favor, Commissioner Mitten not present and not voting.
7	MR. BERGSTEIN: I'm sorry, could I just
8	ask that the motion be noted more in terms of denying
9	the request for relief from the requirement that all
10	parking be underground based upon the provision of two
11	above ground parking structures because it's about
12	
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
14	Well we'll just tell you and you can make the motion.
15	Okay. Now this is the fashion in which I think we
16	need to move. Again, I'm going to read the
17	requirement 1606.7. All parking spaces within a
18	ballpark site shall be provided underground and the
19	proposal we got for June would be the 23 rd , which is
20	the alternative 925 above ground parking spaces within
21	a mixed use addition to the ballpark. And I'll open
22	that up for discussion.
23	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I would move
24	approval of that preferred alternative.
25	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'll second.

1 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved 2 and seconded. All those in favor? 3 (Ayes.) 4 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition? 5 So ordered. Staff would you record the vote. that okay Mr. Bergstein? 6 7 MR. BERGSTEIN: I think we got it, yes. Okay. 8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Staff will record the 9 MRS. SCHELLIN: 10 vote 4-0-1 to approve the relief from Section 1606.7 11 to provide for the above ground parking spaces within 12 a mixed use addition to the ballpark. Commissioner moving, Commissioner Turnbull 13 14 Commissioners Jeffries and Hood in favor, Commissioner 15 Mitten not present and not voting. 16 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. While 17 we're on parking I wanted to talk about, and I think 18 there's an OP report, the south side parking area. I 19 think our regulations require that it be covered and I don't think it's covered. I think it's kind of down 2.0 21 in the pit and I'm not sure if it's covered. And the 22 rationale, I think, and anyone can chime in to help 23 me, make sure I keep this straight, was so that there can be some development over the top of that. 24 Does 25 anybody else remember it like that?

1	MR. BERGSTEIN: Mr. Chairman, I do need
2	to correct you that there's no requirement that the
3	parking be covered just that it be underground. The
4	question is whether or not you accept the design as
5	chosen, that is provided for you which has changed
6	from being underground parking that's covered to
7	underground parking that's not, you feel that meets
8	the design criteria for the overlay.
9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
10	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Did you want to
11	talk about that now?
12	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. I wanted to
13	talk about it since we're on parking.
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay. Well here
15	the exact reverse is in play. In May they produced a
16	drawing that showed a plaza here, a grassed areas as
17	well, a front yard if you will to the building.
18	Then they come forward with a proposal
19	that's an open pit. Now they've come back with a
20	response to our concern but I prefer the original,
21	that is that showed a plaza. Certainly they're not
22	asking us to approve a building, it's a theoretical
23	building at this point that may never be built or
24	approved.
25	I'm troubled by this because I wanted

1 to discuss this last but we can discuss it now. Ι 2 think I'm willing to go with a compromise that's been 3 produced, to be specific un-numbered drawings, but a 4 series of four drawings that you saw probably. 5 My point is I prefer the plaza but I know And there are other actions, the one 6 that's costly. 7 we just took and so forth, that I feel I'm willing to compromise on this tent device if you will, but I 8 don't know how you feel. 9 10 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But is the 11 applicant asking, I mean this parking is already below 12 grade. 13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's already 14 below so it meets, as I've been corrected, it meets 15 the requirement under the --COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So what is the 16 17 applicant -- then what are they asking us to do as it 18 relates to the south plaza? 19 MR. BERGSTEIN: They're not asking you to 20 do anything but approve the plans as provided. In this case it would be if the Commission felt that that 21 22 portion of the plan was unacceptable, someone would have to indicate that and the Commission would have to 23 24 agree that instead of it being shown as it's now

shown, it should be covered as originally illustrated

1 in the first submittal. 2 So this is a question for the Commission 3 to initiate, the actual drawing is within what's 4 provided by the regulations. 5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me start and I think Mr. Parsons is opposite of where I'm coming 6 7 from. I agree with it as is shown in the latter part 8 where it just shows that it's below grade. 9 agree with as it was presented to us last. That's why 10 T --11 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So the first one 12 as shown on the cover of the original book, that's The second one I don't think we saw, it just 13 14 said it's going to be cars, you're going to be looking 15 at cars. But it would meet 16 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 17 our requirement. 18 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. 19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. It met 20 our requirements. 21 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And the third one places canvas or other kind of fabric tent-like 22 23 structures so that people won't be looking down into 24 a parking lot. And you're willing to look into the 25 parking lot, I just want to make sure.

1	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, you know,
2	we're making concessions and I just think that we're
3	trying to make this thing work and make it work right.
4	And I just think that while we just voted the two
5	structures down, I'll just you give and take a little,
6	and that's kind of where I'm coming from.
7	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well that's where
8	I was coming from too, and I was compromising from
9	grass to tents.
10	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But the way I
11	understand it now, and I stand to be corrected because
12	I can tell you pulling this stuff and reading this
13	stuff, like I said at the hearing, it's all over the
14	place and trying to pull it together is very
15	difficult.
16	But I understand that there's no
17	requirement in the CG overlay that says that it has to
18	be covered, and that's what I was just told.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No, that's right.
20	It's a design issue clearly.
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well I'll open it
22	up to the rest because I know when I'm outnumbered.
23	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, no, Mr.
24	Chairman, you just made the statement when you
25	referred to it as below grade, which to me is not

To me this is surface below-grade underground. parking, it's not underground. I mean if we're talking semantics it's below grade but it's not underground, it's surface below-grade parking. think what Mr. Parsons is saying is that by having the tented structure we are making a compromise from the original plan, which showed it totally underground covered with a green plaza, rather than just having looking out over into this exposed surface graded parking lot, which I think offers, which is compromise. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: This is the main ceremonial entrance where the administrative offices of the team are going to be and they're going to be looking down into a parking lot. It's wrong. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know I have to yield but I will be frankly honest and this is where my lack of, and I'm not putting myself down, but this is where my lack of architectural experience comes in because I don't really see a difference between looking at the cars and looking at those I really don't. I really don't. tents. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, now I got you. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I really don't

I'm being frankly honest with you. But I will yield

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 to the experts. I don't have any problem yielding 2 because we want to make sure we make the best decision 3 possible, and I think that's where we are. Do you want 4 to chime in on it? 5 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I concur with In fact, it seems to me that 6 Commissioner Parsons. 7 the plaza's actually deteriorating, it seems to be I had problems with it from the 8 getting worse. 9 beginning but, you know, looking at sort of what's 10 come through subsequently I'd have to go back to what was submitted back in May, May 3rd. 11 12 Again, it goes back to that little dirty secret no one wants to talk about is that our land 13 14 resources in the District is valuable and we just 15 cannot put it in a position to not get the most benefit. And I think this fairly large triangle when 16 you're looking at parking down there is just not a 17 18 very attractive thing, particularly given that it's at 19 one of the more prominent portals that we're trying to create into the District. 20 I think it's kind of 21 counter-intuitive and I'm not in favor of it. So I 22 would prefer that we go back to the May version. 23 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. That's fine. 24 25 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: There's one thing

that hasn't been said here. We've all worked so hard, this Commission, 18 federal agencies, the Mayor on making the Anacostia one of the best rivers in the country, and if this is our first effort it's got to be first class to the degree we can do it. And this is the Anacostia River side, this is where people are going to spill down and go to what, hopefully, is an exciting waterfront. And to have this pit there just doesn't make sense. It just doesn't.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: You know, I just don't want to get -- you said something earlier, Chairman, concessions, and I just don't think this is quite the way we should be sort of approaching this.

I mean we really need to be very honest and true to what we ultimately are trying to achieve here at the ballpark district and that's a world class development.

I was just in Chicago looking at Millennium Park, and I mean there was a lot of drama getting up to that, but it was well worth it that, you know, that particular development. And I want to just make certain that we don't get into this sort of trading back and forth here and that we really try to stick to what will really create the best product.

So I'm trying to keep that in mind as we

go down this list and I just wanted to put that on the 2 record. 3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just say, 4 when I say concessions I don't mean give it away. 5 I'm not saying that. I just know that there have been some projects in this city that I've sat on this 6 7 Commission and voted on and rolled back by and 8 actually there's a street in this city that I don't go 9 down any more because I think we approved something 10 that we should not have. And I'm just being frankly 11 honest. And some of that was due to me not really 12 knowing exactly, I was at a learning stage at that 13 point. 14 And when I say concessions, I think 15 everything has its balances and that's all I'm trying to do. Believe me, just getting through this is hard 16 17 enough. So can I get a motion? 18 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. I make a 19 motion that as it relates to the plan the South Plaza, that we approve the plan that was submitted May 3rd 20 21 2006 by the applicant for the design of the South 22 Plaza. 23 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Grass versus the 24 tents. 25 All right. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's

1	been moved. Second?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Can I ask a
3	question first?
4	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Can I get a
5	second and then we'll open it to discussion.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh I'll second
7	it.
8	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been
9	moved and seconded. Discussion? Mr. Turnbull?
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You're asking for
11	the one covered with grass?
12	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, the one with
13	grass.
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So the compromise
15	plan is taken off then? Got you.
16	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been
17	moved and properly seconded. All those in favor?
18	(Ayes.)
19	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?
20	So ordered. Staff would you record the vote?
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
22	$4-0-1$ to approve the South Plaza as per the May $3^{\rm rd}$
23	plan that was submitted by the applicant, Commissioner
24	Jeffries moving, Commissioner Parsons seconding,
25	Commissioners Hood and Turnbull, Commissioner Mitten

1	not present and not voting.
2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Bergstein,
3	let me just ask you a quick question. Because there's
4	four of us, three of us need to all agree, correct?
5	MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes.
6	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thank
7	you. Thank you colleagues.
8	Let's move right now to the next relief,
9	the next requirement
10	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Now also let me
11	make certain I'm clear. There's other aspects of the
12	ballpark that we're going to so we're just going to
13	almost pick this thing apart and just go place by
14	place in terms of voting up and down, right?
15	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So we'll go to
17	other parts for retail and all those things, we're
18	going to go right down?
19	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right down. And
20	I went through all the reliefs and this is what I
21	asked in the hearing about the relief, I'm going to
22	try to get all the requirements and the reliefs that
23	they ask for.
24	COMMISSIONER JEFFRRIES: Right. Okay.
25	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We're done

1 with parking. The next one is 1606.14, the minimum 2 floor to ceiling height of area devoted to preferred 3 uses shall be 14 feet clear. That's what 4 requirement is. And one of the reliefs with parking 5 structures, the floor to ceiling height varies from 12 to 17 feet. 6 7 First, before we do that let me go back and I think the question came up at the end of the 8 9 hearing also, we spoke about whether the applicant was 10 asking for a variance or a waiver. And I think that 11 all of these should be treated as a variance. That's 12 just where I'm coming from. I think it's clean and 13 14 MR. BERGSTEIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, 15 I was distracted, but for the relief you're under because you've denied the parking --16 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We don't need to 17 That's why I moved to something else. 18 do that. 19 MR. BERGSTEIN: Okay. I'm sorry. 20 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was trying to 21 cover my mistake up, not let everybody know, we don't 22 really even need to deal with that, that's why I went 23 to the variance and waiver. I moved away from that. 24 But anyway, I made a mistake, we don't need to do 25 that.

But anyway let's deal with this variance and waiver issue because I think that's how we're going to proceed and you can keep me clean, Mr. Bergstein.

We still need to handle, under 1606.14, no we don't need to do that either. Okay. But we still need to deal with this issue of the variances and the waiver, whether we're going to treat these as a variances or waiver. And we need to establish some type of, I look at as though like we do our PUDs, and I don't know if we want to go to that magnitude regulations because in our it says the Commission will look at a relief from a variance or special exception, and I think it just keeps it clean.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, waiver is introducing a new term that's not in our regulations, and the variance is just a way to go. Mr. Bergstein, have you got any views on this?

MR. BERGSTEIN: I agree with you that the Zoning Act provides for special exceptions in variances. You have the PUD process which also allows for relief from the zoning regulations based upon a certain standard. I don't see anything within the provisions that you're looking at that allow for a waiver, other than there's three provisions for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

parking for the extent of preferred uses and for additional above ground parking for which a waiver is specifically allowed and there's a specific standard. But there's no over-arching provision for a waiver that I see in the regulations.

I believe the applicant is arguing that point 22 provides some sort of general waiver requirement, but there's no standard that's been proffered to us that you could apply to determine whether or not to grant the waiver as they're calling it.

We advertised it using the term strict applicability of the zoning regulations, which is a variance term, but it's up to you to decide whether or not there is sort of an over-arching ability to request waivers from all the requirements in the section. But then you'd have to articulate what that standard is. If not, use the variance standard where they have to show an exceptional condition and that, as a result of that exceptional condition, the strict application of the zoning regulations result in a practical difficulty.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Bergstein, for that explanation but as I stated I'm inclined to look at this as a variance and I'll open

1	it up for discussion.
2	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Agreed.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons
4	agrees. Mr. Jeffries? Okay. Thank you. Moving
5	right along with 1606.14e, and I'm going to ask Mr.
6	Bergstein and you guys to help keep me on track.
7	MR. BERGSTEIN: You need to deal with
8	1606.14d in terms of the preferred alternative because
9	even with the preferred alternative, some of the
10	height of the retail is less than the 14 feet floor
11	ceiling required, so you do need to
12	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me
13	back up, 1606.14d, the minimum floor to ceiling height
14	of area devoted to preferred uses shall be 14 feet
15	clear. The relief request, as was already stated with
16	preferred alternative, the height varies between 11
17	and 23 feet. And we've already decided to deal with
18	this as a variance. Mr. Jeffries?
19	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Mr. Chair, I want
20	to ask a question of the Office of Planning.
21	Apparently the retail floor to ceiling heights vary
22	from 11 to 23 feet. Where is the 11 feet floor to
23	ceiling in the latest plan?
24	MR. LAWSON: I didn't get a clear
25	understanding from the applicant exactly where the 11

1 feet was versus the 23 feet. The 11 feet would be 2 within the mixed-use buildings as opposed to within 3 the -- if my memory serves me right, it would be 4 within the mixed-use buildings as opposed to being 5 within the ballpark footprint. And it's because of that we had somewhat 6 7 fewer concerns about a wide variety of retail heights because it allows for a wider variety of retail type 8 9 tenants and allows the buildings to respond to the fairly steep pitch and grade philosophy. 10 11 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. So it's 12 not -- but you're pretty certain it's not along First 13 Street? 14 MR. LAWSON: That's my understanding. 15 There was some retail along First Street that also would not fully comply with the 14 foot height, but it 16 was a lesser amount, and certainly with the option two 17 18 that was also put forward of extending the retail out 19 closer to the property line, the retail that bumps out 20 would be able to conform fully to the 14 foot height. 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, we're going 22 to get to the depth later. Right now I'm --23 No, no, I meant in terms of MR. LAWSON: 24 height. If it's deeper they'd be able to provide the 25 height for that section that comes out from the

1	footprint of the ballpark itself.
2	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jeffries, I'm
4	trying to follow your question. You asked was the
5	less height, 11 feet, on First Street?
6	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. He's
7	thinking that the 11 foot floor to ceiling is probably
8	part of the preferred option along N Street and not
9	necessarily on First Street.
10	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: On N Street?
11	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, it's
12	probably on N Street, the 11 foot, because they're
13	saying 11 to 23 feet, I mean 23 feet, yes but 11 feet
14	that gets a little low for retail. But I just wanted
15	to get a sense of where it is.
16	And obviously the critical retail corridor
17	here is First Street. So I mean if the Office of
18	excuse me?
19	MR. LAWSON: Yes, if I may. I just
20	received some information that actually would we're
21	both kind of right, it would be within the mixed-use
22	buildings but the 11 feet would be within the mixed-
23	use building portion that fronts on to First Street.
24	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Let
25	MR. LAWSON: The mixed-use buildings have

1	retail frontage on N Street and on First Street. Some
2	of the retail on First Street would be the retail that
3	would have 11 foot height.
4	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So it would be
5	the retail space that's what 3,200 square feet?
6	MR. LAWSON: Now I'm getting more advice
7	again. Actually, okay, now I understand the plan I'm
8	looking at. It's actually the retail that's fronting
9	onto the Plaza so it's neither on N Street nor on
10	First Street. My apologies, Mr. Chair. It would some
11	of the retail facing onto the center Half Street Plaza
12	entrance to the ballpark site.
13	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So it's the
14	2,727 square foot space?
15	MR. LAWSON: I don't have the drawing in
16	front of me.
17	COMMISSIONER JEFRFRIES: Oh it's the
18	ticket office. Okay. I just wanted to
19	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me do this
20	though because we want to make sure we're on the
21	record and we don't take comments from the audience,
22	even though we appreciate your help, if you could let
23	Office of Planning. Everybody, we all need some help
24	on this even if you can just let the Office of
25	Planning know we're appreciate it and they will relay

1	it to us. That way we'd keep some uniformity here.
2	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And let me just
3	make a motion that we grant relief with the preferred
4	alternative, the height variance, varying between 11
5	feet and 23 feet.
6	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second.
7	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved
8	and properly seconded. All those in favor?
9	(Ayes.)
10	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?
11	So ordered. Staff, would you record the vote?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff record the vote 4-
13	0-1 to approve relief from Section 1606.14d to allow
14	height from 11 to 23 feet, Commissioner Jeffries
15	making the motion. Commissioner Parsons seconding,
16	Commissioners Turnbull and Hood in favor, Commissioner
17	Mitten not present and not voting.
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
19	The next requirement is 1606.14e, the average depth
20	from the exterior facade in towards the center of the
21	building for space devoted to preferred retail shall
22	be at a 50 feet minimum. I think on the 30 th , no I'm
23	sorry, May 3 rd , average depth from the parking
24	structures is 31 percent.
25	MR. BERGSTEIN: Commissioner, can I help
ı	

1	you on this?
2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I need as
3	much help as I can yet. Yes.
4	MR. BERGSTEIN: Okay. The 31 percent is
5	for the parking structures that you denied. The
6	application doesn't really indicate what the depth is,
7	what the average depth is when you combine the
8	preferred alternative with the ballpark, but from
9	reading their submission they seem to concede that
10	it's less than 50 percent. But there's no exact
11	figure.
12	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So we don't need
13	to deal with that?
14	MR. BERGSTEIN: Oh no, you do. It's
15	just not a specific figure that I can offer you for
16	what the depth is but it's less than 50 percent so
17	they do need relief.
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I have a question
20	for the Office of Planning. I remember Option 2 took
21	the retail to the site line, correct?
22	Excuse me?
23	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I actually asked
24	him to do that so we'll let him do that.
25	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, I'll wait.

1	So I just wanted to know what is the average depth of
2	the retail space, particularly along First Street if
3	we were to take the line, take it out to the building
4	line, I think that was Option 2 that was presented.
5	MR. LAWSON: I'd have to look up that
6	number, I know that it's in one of the earlier
7	applications. It was well in excess of an average of
8	50 feet. Without that bump-out of retail, the average
9	depth was about 30 feet so if you include that bump-
10	out to the property line, which I believe is certainly
11	in excess of 20 feet, you'd end up with an average
12	well in excess of 50 feet along First Street.
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner, if
14	we look up under Tab (i) and my stuff is so
15	disorganized I can't find it, but it's under Tab (i).
16	I think it came under the June 23^{rd} .
17	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: The May 3 ^{rd?}
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: June 23rd.
19	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Somehow my eye is
20	gone.
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know my eye's
22	missing too. You're sure it's June 23 rd ? Oh that's
23	what we just got. The's the one, the last submittal
24	we got.
25	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Let me just go

right to my point. I'm interested in more retail, not less. I'm interested in deeper depths, not more shallow depths. So I'm interested in Option 2. I don't know what that does to our discussions up here, but that's where I'm at and I'm not certain whether, and I know there's funding that needs to be identified and so forth, but that's the route I'd like I'd like to make a motion that we approve if I can do this. Mr. Bergstein, am I going in the right

direction or do I need to pull back?

Well, you're in the MR. BERGSTEIN: middle of going through the types of relief that's being requested. As I understand it, even if you include the retail, the only effect that Option 2 has on the relief that's being requested is depth. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Right.

And what I read in the MR. BERGSTEIN: applicant's submittal is that Option 2 may ameliorate the depth but there seemed to be an uncertainty, so I think you still need to grant depth relief even if you go with Option 2. But if want to interrupt this part of the discussion and indicate whether or not you're accepting Option 1 or Option 1 to include the retail component of Option 2, which is what the applicant had

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 suggested as an alternative -2 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But wait 3 minute, I thought that the Office of Planning stated 4 that from Option 2 that those depths exceeded 50 feet? 5 Did you not say that or did I mishear you? 6 MR. LAWSON: That's certainly our 7 understanding that the average depth would easily 8 exceed the 50 foot. 9 MR. BERGSTEIN: If that's the case then, 10 you don't need to have this discussion if you're going 11 to require Option 2. 12 Right. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So we 13 don't have to make a motion, we're just not granting 14 relief. I mean if, depending on where this Commission 15 is going. Right. But then I think 16 MR. BERGSTEIN: 17 you actually do need to resolve that first if you're 18 going to in terms of the application that's before 19 you, if what you're going to require is not just 20 Option 1 with an alternative to do the retail 21 component of Option 2 but actually require Option 1 22 with the retail component of Option 2, then you might 23 as well do that because then you really don't have to reach the need for depth, if the Office of Planning is 24

correct and I've no reason to doubt them.

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But we need to 2 deny the request for a variance for retail depth? 3 MR. BERGSTEIN: No, you don't need to 4 because --5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And approve Option 2, as shown on sheet A4 in the May 3rd submission. 6 7 That's what we really should be doing because what they've asked us to do is once again approve two 8 9 options so they can fall back if they don't have any 10 money. 11 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But Commissioner 12 Persons, my understanding, based on what the Office of 13 Planning has said is that if we were to say we want 14 them to do Option 2, then we're not actually granting 15 them any relief on the retail depth because they think 16 it's within it. Within our regulations. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: 17 Well, let's go 18 that way then. 19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well --20 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I mean unless 21 they're going to change something here but I'm saying 22 that if this Commission is interested in Option 2 with 23 the depths that have been set forth, and if we're comfortable that it exceeds the 50 feet depth that's 24 25 set in our regs, then I think we should just make a

1 motion that this Commission goes with Option 2 and 2 that's that. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But let me make 3 4 sure I understand what the applicant has asked for and 5 I want to make sure that you do, too. Well I want to make sure I do, not necessarily you. 6 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 7 But they want 8 options. They want Option 1. 9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: They've asked for 10 Option 1 with a request to go forward with the retail 11 component of Option 2. 12 Ιf the funding MR. BERGSTEIN: is 13 available. In other words, they could do Option 1 and 14 if they only do Option 1, that would be lawful. 15 want you to provide them the flexibility, if the funding is available, to then proceed with the retail 16 17 component of Option 2. If they only do Option 1 they 18 do need relief from the depth requirement. Ιf 19 they're able to go with the retail component of Option 20 2, what I've just heard is that they do not need to 21 obtain relief from the depth requirement. 22 So if you're entertaining the notion of 23 giving them the option to do only Option 1, with the option to do Option 2, then you will need to grant the 24

depth relief in case they only do Option 1.

1 Ιf you're going to say you're 2 interested in approving Option 1 with the retail 3 component of Option 2, then you don't need to grant 4 depth relief because they will provide enough retail 5 depth on average to meet the requirement. It's complex but that's what it is. 6 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 7 So I'd like to make a motion that we approve Option 2 as a retail 8 option along First Street that was presented to us in 9 the June 23rd, no, that was the May 3rd. The May 3rd 10 11 proposal, sheet A4. 12 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second. 13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved 14 and properly seconded. Discussion. 15 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I quess I hear, you know, we're trying flexibility and it seems as if 16 17 we need to be sort of trying to narrow this window 18 rather than keep it too wide open and we're getting 19 close, we need to be, the way I see it, be very clear 20 about exactly what we're looking for. So that's why 21 I just think it's better that at this point we just 22 start to say exactly what we're in favor of. Yes, and I was 23 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 24 actually in favor of giving the applicant 25 flexibility.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's where I was so I would be voting against this. I will not be voting against the final well I will be voting against this particular piece because I just think that this whole thing throughout has been a back and forth and flexibility and I just don't want to nail them to this point. I think want to give them room. That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed? Opposed. Staff would you record the vote?	1	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.
voting against the final well I will be voting against this particular piece because I just think that this whole thing throughout has been a back and forth and flexibility and I just don't want to nail them to this point. I think want to give them room. That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's where I
against this particular piece because I just think that this whole thing throughout has been a back and forth and flexibility and I just don't want to nail them to this point. I think want to give them room. That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	3	was so I would be voting against this. I will not be
that this whole thing throughout has been a back and forth and flexibility and I just don't want to nail them to this point. I think want to give them room. That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	4	voting against the final well I will be voting
forth and flexibility and I just don't want to nail them to this point. I think want to give them room. That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	5	against this particular piece because I just think
them to this point. I think want to give them room. That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	6	that this whole thing throughout has been a back and
That's just my opinion. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	7	forth and flexibility and I just don't want to nail
COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	8	them to this point. I think want to give them room.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	9	That's just my opinion.
comments? What was your motion again? Can I persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	10	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine.
persuade you seriously, did somebody second it? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	11	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	12	comments? What was your motion again? Can I
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons. Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	13	persuade you seriously, did somebody second it?
Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes.
and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	15	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons.
was Option 2. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	16	Okay. He's right beside me. Okay. It's been moved
19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was 20 submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . 21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been 22 moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? 23 (Ayes.) 24 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	17	and properly seconded, all those in favor? And that
submitted to the Commission May 3 rd . VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	18	was Option 2.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	19	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That was
moved and properly seconded. All those in favor? (Ayes.) VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	20	submitted to the Commission May 3 rd .
23 (Ayes.) 24 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?	22	moved and properly seconded. All those in favor?
	23	(Ayes.)
Opposed. Staff would you record the vote?	24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposed?
	25	Opposed. Staff would you record the vote?

1	MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the
2	vote 3-1-1 to approve Option 2 as the retail option
3	from Sheet A4 from the May 3 rd submission,
4	Commissioner Jeffries moving, Commissioner Parsons
5	seconding, Commissioner Turnbull in favor,
6	Commissioner Hood opposed, Commissioner Mitten not
7	present and not voting.
8	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Moving along,
9	1606.16. The requirement, each building or structure
10	located on the portion of South Capitol Street that
11	lies within the ballpark site shall be set back for
12	its entire height in frontage not less than 15 feet.
13	For the relief requested applicant wishes
14	to extend the pedestrian ramps into the setback area
15	in order for the public to be able to view the
16	Capitol. And in our last submittal, I think it was
17	dated 29 th , we had some views which I think were
18	requested by Commissioner Jeffries.
19	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes.
20	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Did you ask for
21	the views, Commissioner?
22	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. Within the
23	actual stadium.
24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Within the
25	actual stadium and I also think there were some views

provided that Mr. Turnbull had asked for dealing with the ramp issue. So with that I open it up for discussion and comments.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you. Well I was really hoping that what we would have would offer something more of an amenity to this building that we could rule on favorably. But I think when I saw sheet 17 of 36, I really am concerned about the streetscape and what this ramp does.

I don't think it does justice to the street. I'm really concerned that from a cityscape, from an urban design, from the fabric of what we're getting, that this thing jutting out really takes away the views of anyone else on the street. And I think it really interferes with views and the street life that's going to be happening on South Capitol Street as a monumental corridor.

I look at this thing, I mean their streetscape shows just one row of trees and these things are smack right up against the trees so that anyone down below looking up or down the street is going to have this layered effect above in their viewshed and I really don't think it adds anything to what we're trying to do with the monumental corridor street. I don't think it really adds a significant

piece to the street that we could hang our hat on and say that this is really great.

I guess there was an element, reading through here, that the AWI architectural design guidelines actually call for a double row of trees along this street, which I wasn't aware of at the time which to me would even make this even more cramped I guess.

I guess as an amenity for the ballpark for the amount of use that someone could get out of this, and one of their other views looking down the street, it sounds like with another building on the other side of N Street you're not going to get much of a view anyways. I mean you'd almost have to be at the very tip of this thing leaning over to actually try to get a glimpse of the Capitol.

I don't see the point of it. I really don't see how it gives you much of a view at all. I just think the gymnastics that you have to go interfering with the basic street wall, I just don't think it's worth it. I just don't think it does anything for anyone.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have to agree with you Commissioner Turnbull. When we heard the presentation at the hearing I was excited, I thought

that would be a great idea. But when I got the views, I would agree you would have to lean pretty far to be able to look and see the Capitol and I don't understand the relevance of it and I don't understand what we're trying to accomplish.

And also I want to make sure we protect the safety of those folks who will be attending the event, the baseball games. So I would not be in favor of what I see and it's unfortunate, this is what I'm looking at, it doesn't have a number.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh I see.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So when I look at this, this does not give me the same enthusiasm as I had when I heard it of what it was actually going to be used for because I just don't see what purpose it serves. And I open it up for any other discussion.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, I'm going to bring Office of Planning back into the picture here. I mean what's your thoughts about this pedestrian ramp and what it adds to our wanting South Capitol to be this monumental civic boulevard.

MR. LAWSON: We've always supported the applicant in the provision of this feature. We thought it was an interesting feature kind of for two main purposes.

First of all, it's an interesting feature for the patrons of the ballpark. We think patrons will use it to get a view of what's happening on South Capitol Street. That would include the dome, it would include the activity, the other buildings, whatever is happening on South Capitol Street. think it will give people that kind of sense of connection back to South Capitol Street as they're moving up and down the ballpark stadium itself and getting some views of the Capitol dome and down towards the waterfront will certainly be part of that. The other reason that we like this feature is we feel that properly designed with all the details we're told, it will be a good architectural feature on This is a long facade, relatively this elevation. speaking, and it can serve to help to emphasize the sense of entry into the stadium and also serve to kind of break up some of that facade length by providing additional articulation kind of in and out on the facade that wouldn't otherwise be provided. So we have always encouraged the applicant in their provision of this feature and we continue to do so. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And Commissioner

Turnbull you had, and I can't seem to find the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	elevation, sorry the perspective looking south on
2	South Capitol that looks at the entire development.
3	Do you have that? Do you have a copy? What sheet
4	number is that?
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: This is sheet 17
6	of 36.
7	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 17 of 36? So
8	looking at it from that perspective if you can look at
9	sheet 17 of 36, you feel that it adds to the
10	streetscape along South Capitol?
11	MR. LAWSON: Yes, actually, I continue to
12	feel that it does.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Would you do that
14	on Pennsylvania Avenue?
15	MR. LARSON: Pardon me, sorry?
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Would you do that
17	on Pennsylvania Avenue?
18	MR. LAWSON: I think this is a case of
19	what's appropriate for this street. I don't disagree
20	with the Commission that some additional articulation
21	of that entry, of that feature, would be helpful and
22	we've had some very preliminary discussions, very
23	preliminary discussions with the applicant about ways
24	that it could be lightened up, made more of an
25	architectural feature because I think we heard the

comments made at the last meeting that some of the concerns anyways were with the design of the feature as well as the existence, I guess, of the feature itself.

And so we think that there are ways that it probably could be improved to incorporate on to that facade a little bit better, but we do think that it's an interesting feature.

Again, I think that the principal purpose for this would be to provide that sense of connection between, you know, augmenting that sense of connection between the ballpark and the federal core to the north and to the waterfront to the south by providing that kind of in and out movement of the pedestrians as they walk up and down the baseball stadium.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But the pedestrians on the street won't be able to see one way or another with this huge ramp structure up in front of them.

MR. LAWSON: Well we think that the ramp structure can be lightened, and I think that's one of the features that we took from the discussion the Commission had last time about some of the heavier features of the structure and ways that it could be lightened to increase that.

1 We think that the views of the pedestrians 2 will still be possible. You have to remember this 3 isn't extending out to the street. This is extending 4 out to the property line, so there will continue to be 5 a fairly extensive sidewalk for pedestrians on the other side, and that also allows for the continuation 6 7 of all this kind of streetscape improvements that we 8 all want to see on South Capitol Street. 9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well this shows 10 the canopy of the trees running up to it. I think that additional work 11 MR. LAWSON: on the nature of the landscaping on South Capitol 12 Street needs to be done. I think that's been raised 13 14 in our report as well as in reports from the District 15 Department of Transportation, that the drawings don't 16 necessarily reflect what we consider to be the 17 ultimate end result for what the landscaping along 18 South Capitol Street is going to be. 19 But the ramp extending out to the property 20 line shouldn't impact the ability to provide the kinds 21 of screetscape improvements that we want to see. 22 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I quess I just 23 can't -- I just feel looking at this elevation that

this really does not do anything for the facade of the

I don't think this does anything for the

building.

24

people on the street. I don't think it gives anything to the life.

I think it's a safety issue, too. I mean this is going to be used one third of the time, 100 days of the year or whatever, and the rest of the time there's going to be these empty platforms up there. And I don't see how that adds to the vitality and integrity of the street that we want to have all of the time.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Turnbull and look forward to his motion to deny it. But I must say that the sketch on the initial submission I'm looking at, 31 of 53, which shows, I think it really makes your point. This is the south entrance, the river entrance, which is steel and the back side of the stadium. And these ramps fit in that architectural venue if you will, but don't fit in this glass and pre-cast stone facade going along South Capitol Street. It's a foreign object that comes out.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I agree with you.

I would make a motion, Mr. Chairman, to decline the applicant's request for 1606.16 to extend the ramp into the 15 feet, to get relief from the 15 foot set back.

2.0

1 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's moved. Is 2 there a second? 3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second. 4 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Discussion. Let 5 me go back to Mr. Lawson because I did have a question as it evolved. And I know there's a motion on the 6 7 table but I just want to open it for discussion. 8 You mentioned that this now was going to be utilized for fans to be able to look out on South 9 10 Capitol Street, but at the hearing, at least the way 11 remember it, it was to look at the Capitol. So again 12 that's why I held this up and that's why I said what This, according to what this view that was 13 14 provided to us, doesn't do that. And that's why I 15 took the position that I took because what is the use. And also Mr. Turnbull said something I 16 17 thought of when I heard drink beer; unfortunately it 18 does I think create a safety issue because people have 19 a tendency I think, and I want to make sure this clear 2.0 for the record, when they get a little intoxicated 21 that they seem to want to throw stuff. Which leads me to my question: 22 what happens on the street level? 23 People are walking back and forth under there, right? 24 MR. LAWSON: That's correct. 25 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I will be

supporting, your motion, Mr. Turnbull. 2 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: My only comment 3 here is I think the goal was an admirable one in terms 4 of what they were trying to achieve. I don't think 5 that it was articulated appropriately to arrive at sort of what they wanted to as it relates to this 6 7 overall street walk. I think you were trying to have some animation and have some movement and so forth and 8 9 so on but I do think that these drawings here just 10 didn't serve the applicant well in terms of pushing 11 this pedestrian because it looks rather 12 disconnected here. So I will be signing on with 13 denial here as well. 14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. It's been 15 moved and properly second. All those in favor? 16 (Ayes.) 17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Aye. Any 18 Well, all those wishing to deny? opposition? 19 Any opposition? So ordered. Staff would you record 2.0 the vote. 21 MRS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record 22 the vote 4-0-1 to deny relief from Section 1606.16 23 with regard to the ramps extending on South Capitol Commissioner Turnbull moving, Commissioner 24 Street.

Parsons seconding, Commissioners Hood and Jeffries in

25

favor, Commissioner Mitten not present and not voting.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me just say for those who are here for our hearing tonight which is supposed to start at 6:30, 06-01, we will be with you shortly and we will also after we finish this special public meeting allow the applicant of that case a little time to get set up and our Chairperson will hopefully join us. And if I'm leaving anything out, Commissioners please don't hesitate to chime in.

There was a request, and let me ask Mr.

Bergstein to help me with this, about a phase development, phase 2 I think was it referred to.

MR. BERGSTEIN: The applicant in their submittals talk about seeking approval for zoning envelope for phase 2 which they describe as the ability to do additional development on the north side, though at the time of the original request there wasn't the mixed use residential building that you have before you now. And they also talk about the ability to develop south of the site.

And I have to confess that it's not clear to me what is the nature of the relief of what they're seeking, the approval they're seeking, because the

1 text this section sets forth, together with 2 underlying zone, what is the zoning envelope as a And so it's unclear to me, 3 matter of right. remains unclear to me what it is that the applicant is 4 5 seeking approval of because, as I said, the zoning envelope is defined by the text. 6 7 So my recommendation would be that you either indicate that that portion of the application 8 is dismissed because it's beyond the scope of the 9 10 design review that is before you or, if you grant it, 11 you indicate what it is that you're granting in terms 12 of approval. 13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Which is going to 14 be hard to do unless Office of Planning can add 15 something to that. That request has been 16 MS. STEINGASSER: 17 withdrawn by the applicant. So that would be the 18 other option. 19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That was real 20 easy, we don't have to deal with it. I didn't know it 21 was withdrawn but anyway, okay, thank you. Next let's talk about this MOU. 22 23 everybody have the MOU? I think in the submissions it was the last submission in the packet that we received 24

on the 29^{th} .

1 MR. BERGSTEIN: It's in your Tab C. 2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Tab C, thank you. It was in mine, it's all out now but I have it. 3 Mr. Bergstein, let me ask you. 4 This 5 agreement, how does this fit into our order? Well, what you've been 6 MR. BERGSTEIN: 7 provided with is, okay, there are certain findings 8 that you need to make in order to grant the 9 application, specifically that building 10 designed and constructed will minimize parking traffic 11 conflict between ballpark patrons and neighborhood 12 residents. They'll encourage the use of bicycles for provision of safe and secure and convenient bike 13 14 storage and it will minimize conflict between vehicles 15 and pedestrians. What you've been provided with is 16 17 preliminary traffic operations and parking plan that 18 sets forth generally how the applicant proposes to 19 meet those requirements. I believe that DDOT wanted to ensure there 20 21 would be greater specificity down the line and so they 22 entered into an MOU, part three of which provides that 23 a traffic and parking plan has to be submitted to DDOT by April 2007. 24 25 There's also a part four that requests specific information from the Sports and Entertainment Commission concerning parking, traffic and other similar issues, and it indicates that DDOT will not consent to any building permit until it receives that information.

So it fits into your order in that you may be able to say, and this is what you have to decide, that with the preliminary traffic plan and the MOU, that gives you enough confidence that you can make the findings that I just stated.

My concern with the MOU is that part three of it doesn't seem to set any consequence if the traffic and parking plan isn't presented in time, and also doesn't address what might happen if DDOT disagrees with the traffic and parking plan. And I'm not sure in terms of part four whether or not the applicant will be able to provide the information needed by DDOT in time to get its building permit, but I'm assuming that that was worked out between the applicant and DDOT.

So my principal concern is the lack of any consequence if they don't provide a traffic and parking plan but DDOT has not requested any greater condition from the Commission, such as indicating that the Certificate of Occupancy won't be granted unless

DDOT indicates that it's satisfied with the traffic and parking plan. They haven't requested that. So you have to decide whether or not the enforcement mechanisms in the MOU are sufficient for you to feel comfortable at the end of the day the traffic and parking plan will address those findings in terms of pedestrian and vehicular traffic that would result from the operation of this new stadium.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well let me start off and I'll hear from my colleagues. I will tell ou that enforceability is always an issue, at least from my standpoint, and we mentioned this at the hearing, I look at how the participants and those who attend the baseball games and how they react. And I stated this previously and I know that they're on the Metro and I think that they're going to use public transportation.

I didn't hear a whole lot about this bike, and I don't know if that was taken off the table. It is in the memorandum about the bike pad I think, what street was it on? I think it was on First Street. But anyway I didn't hear a lot about that but I see in the MOU it is mentioned, bike and pedestrian use.

But my issue is I think that people won't come, and I may be wrong and I'll go out on this one,

1	I think people won't come to events where corrective
2	measures are not put in place or ongoing and I see
3	that they have an MOU with the Department of
4	Transportation and I believe that they're going to try
5	and do what's in this MOU. Period. I have the
6	confidence level that this will happen because people
7	are not going to keep going and a lot of congestion.
8	I think you will have a complaint, not just from the
9	patrons but from the city as a whole, if that issue is
10	not rectified ongoing.
11	The first couple of times it's going to
12	have to be tweaked and I feel confident with what I
13	have here in front of me. And I'll just leave it at
14	that and open it up for discussion.
15	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Bergstein, I
16	want to go the top of page 5. Do you have a copy of
17	the agreement?
18	MR, BERGSTEIN: I just realized I left
19	mine upstairs. Oh I've got it now, thank you very
20	much. No, this is actually the ANC resolution.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I could read it to
22	you if that's easier. I'm trying to decide whether
23	this is a wet noodle or a stick. Okay. It says prior
24	to DDOT providing its consent to the issuance of any

building permit -- and I'm trying to understand the

In other words, is there some 1 meaning of that. 2 process in this city that a building permit won't be 3 issued without the consent of DDOT? 4 MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So this is a pretty heavy provision here isn't it? 6 7 MR. BERGSTEIN: It's an extraordinary That's why I'm hoping that the applicant 8 and DDOT understood what they were doing here because 9 10 basically there's a lot of information that needs to 11 be provided by DDOT and it suggests that DDOT won't 12 consent to any building permit that it has the ability to consent to and I'm not sure if it's all building 13 14 permits or just those building permits that deal with 15 activities that encroach or abut public space. But this does say that until all these 16 17 things are provided that are enumerated in part four, 18 that the Sports & Entertainment Commission can't pull 19 any building permits which DDOT --20 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Right. 21 MR. BERGSTEIN: it really is So 22 extraordinary provision and I was just noting that I 23 had assumed that the building permits for the stadium 24 would be pulled pretty much as soon as the Zoning 25 Commission order came out, which I would assume would

1 be, I would hope would be very quickly after this 2 vote. What this imposes is a delay until all 3 this information is provided. And that is a pretty 4 5 significant enforcement tool, if that's what the parties intended. 6 7 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So your concern about this instrument is that it's unenforceable? 8 MR. BERGSTEIN: 9 It's just that my only 10 concern is the previous -- this part deals with issues 11 that DDOT needs addressed. The previous part, which 12 is part three and that begins at the bottom of page 2, 13 you'll see it says Traffic Operation and Parking Plan? 14 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. 15 MR. BERGSTEIN: And it provides on (a) at the next page that the plan will be provided on April 16 30th, and then the remainder sets forth what the plan 17 18 should contain. 19 What I didn't see, and I'm ending it at 20 the bottom of page 4 which begins in part 5, it talks about DDOT to review, modify and approve the TOPP 21 22 within 30 days, but it doesn't say what happens if the 23 TOPP is not provided within the time period and what happens if DDOT disapproves the Traffic Operation and 24

Parking Plan.

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, they 2 probably don't get --3 MR. BERGSTEIN: Unless by modified it 4 means that the Sports Commission agrees to make all 5 the changes that DDOT suggests. If that's what they're intending then that too would have a fairly 6 7 significant enforcement tool. Normally, there's something that says what 8 9 happens after, what I'm reading at (f), so either it means that DDOT has the absolute right to modify the 10 11 Traffic Operation and Parking Plan, in which case 12 there would be significant enforcement, but if it 13 doesn't then it's not clear to me what happens if the 14 parking plan isn't provided or if DDOT disagrees with 15 the parking plan. That's my only concern. 16 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you. Well 17 judgment this is beyond the scope of 18 activities. And it's only in effect until the end of 19 the first season, right? I mean it's over in December 2008 so it's either going to work or it's not and 20 21 renegotiate something for the second season. 22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And Chairman, I 23 agree with you. I clearly think it's in the best interest of all parties and this will work itself out 24

and unless I'm missing something this doesn't seem to

1	be in our jurisdiction.
2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I may just
3	differ with you and Mr. Parsons just a small bit,
4	because in the regulations it says minimizing parking
5	and traffic conflict between ballpark patrons and
6	neighborhood residents. And while I know there's an
7	enforceability issue it's still in the regulations to
8	a point.
9	So I'm thinking that and I again I go back
10	to my first statement so we don't need to belabor and
11	argue this one because I think that folks won't come
12	if it ain't right.
13	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Right. I agree
14	with you.
15	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we
16	agree, so we all agree that we don't need to do
17	anything. We all agree.
18	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And quite frankly
19	we have really nothing to review here.
20	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good. All
21	right. I think that's all I have, except for I did
22	want to acknowledge that I think we've covered a lot
23	that was in the NCPC submittal.
24	We did look at the there was something
25	and I want to make sure, I'd like to do this,

Southwest Neighborhood Assembly had mentioned to us about providing jobs and other issues, I think that's been taken of in another forum.

I just want to run down the list of ANC. I know one of the issues was this traffic around the area and the pedestrians, not who come to the game and participate but the pedestrians who live in the neighborhood. There's information in the record that that's being looked at, someone's working on that, and I hope that that happens. I'm not sure. All we can do is make requests or put it to some degree that this MOU, and it's mentioned in the MOU, and we have a confidence level that that's going to work. And that's where I am on that. Anything else?

COMMISSIONER JEFFRRIES: Yes, just one thing and I'm sorry that I'm going back, but I was looking over a couple of things here. I just want to make certain as it relates to our discussion around the South Plaza, that I made this motion about the green space. I just want to get some clarity and I want to get that from the Office of Planning about parking spaces, because I don't want to impact on the number of parking spaces.

What's the number of parking spaces as it relates to the proposal for South Plaza that was

1	submitted May 3 rd ? How many parking spaces?
2	MS. STEINGASSER: I believe that was 114
3	in the May 3 rd .
4	COMMISSIONER JEFFRRIES: Okay. And that
5	number stays the same throughout the subsequent
6	proposals?
7	MS. STEINGASSER: No. The open plaza had
8	300 spaces in it.
9	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So what accounts
10	for the difference?
11	MS. STEINGASSER: The elevation.
12	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Just the
13	elevation?
14	MS. STEINGASSER: Right. Because it was
15	open there was not the need for the height.
16	MR. LAWSON: Sorry. Were you asking what
17	was the difference between 114 and 300?
18	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: No, no I mean not
19	the actual number but why is there a difference? Why
20	the difference? How did we lose
21	MR. LAWSON: Well, our understanding was
22	that because of agreements between Major League
23	Baseball and the District, that the number of parking
24	spaces in that location needed to actually be about
25	needed to be 300 spaces. So they needed to find a way

1	to fit 300 spaces on the south side of the ballpark.
2	
3	There were concerns with the ability, this
4	is just my understanding, but our understanding is
5	that there were problems with the ability to put those
6	parking spaces entirely underground and stay within
7	the budgets that were set for the parking.
8	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So it's not a
9	practical difficulty
10	MR. LAWSON: Sorry, I was going to
11	continue, and also there may be some grading problems
12	to provide access in a safe and adequate way from
13	Potomac Avenue into the parking. I don't know if
14	those plans for providing 300 parking spaces entirely
15	underground were ever done, I don't know how far that
16	analysis went because we didn't see it. It may be that
17	the applicant went through actually trying to put
18	those entirely underground and it just simply wasn't
19	possible. I can't answer that.
20	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. So there
21	could have been some sort of practical difficulty of
22	getting 300 underground?
23	MR. LAWSON: There were grading problems
24	associated with the increase in the number of parking
25	spaces. It just takes up more space so it spreads out

over more space so it's more difficult to kind of tuck it underneath.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And the applicant actually sat down with you and sort of walked you through what those difficulties were? I mean you could actually see it visually or through illustrations?

Well, as I said, we saw the MR. LAWSON: original proposal course for the entirely of underground parking with the plaza and then lawn on top if it. And, of course, we saw the more recent proposals with the open parking and then the parking with the tents of the top. I didn't see a proposal that showed the parking entirely, 300 parking spaces entirely underground, but the applicant did advise us that it wasn't feasible for them to do it and they raised economic issues and they also raised issues related to the grading along South Capitol Street and the changes of grade down to where the parking would have to go.

MR. BERGSTEIN: And if I could just add, because they put 300 down in the south, they reduced the total number from the north down to 925. So if it turns out that they can't as a matter of fact, as Mr. Lawson just indicated, if they can't put 300 parking

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 spaces in the south then they won't be able to provide 2 a total of 1,225 parking spaces because it reduced the 3 total number of parking spaces to the north under a 4 plan that you accepted. 5 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: The 925. 925 so if you take 300 6 BERGSTEIN: 7 and 925 it's 1,225, anything less than that would mean they can't provide the 1,225 on site if they can't 8 9 accommodate it underground in the south. 10 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I don't 11 think, and I was just doing a wrap up --12 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I've got a couple more issues, Mr. Chair. 13 14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good. Go 15 right ahead. 16 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: First I want to 17 talk about signage and the naming rights which has become the standard practice throughout this country. 18 19 I think we should preclude naming rights opportunities 20 on South Capitol Street. 21 Now there's one image, or a number of 22 images I quess we've seen, I'll pick one up, again 23 it's un-numbered. We were using it for the 24 discussion on the ramps, and here is shown a banner 25 saying "The Nationals." It's flush with the facade,

that is it's not protruding out over the sidewalk, but I'm reminded of the Verizon Center, well you know where the Verizon Center is, and I think with the Capitol Dome on South Capitol Street the temptation would be to put what I would call commercial advertising, which is what naming rights is, on that facade. And I don't think it should be.

In our record is a diagram that I think was presented by the applicant to the Planning Commission. You may remember this but it's a series of exhibits having to do with lighting and so forth and one is called proposed signage and it's called exterior naming rights opportunities, and the two entrances on South Capitol Street are shown as that potential. Not a banner like this that says Nationals, but says Anthony Hood Stadium of whatever it's going to say. Are you in for that?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well if it says

Anthony Hood I have no problems with it being on South

Capitol Street. Actually, I don't have any problems

at all but anyway.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. The other major naming opportunity is the southern entrance, that is towards South Capitol Street, but that one's proposed with 17 foot high letters. I

1	cannot imagine the necessity to have 17 foot high
2	letters. It just seems way out of scale and overdone.
3	
4	So I want to suggest that we eliminate any
5	opportunities for commercial exterior naming rights.
6	I mean if they want to put up a banner that says "The
7	Nationals," I don't have any problem with that.
8	Let me finish my thought, I sidetracked,
9	I'm sorry. That there be no naming right
LO	opportunities on South Capital Street and that the
L1	sign on the southern entrance be limited to six foot
L2	high letters. And I just picked that size as
L3	something I think is more in scale with what we're
L4	trying to do here.
L5	And they also want to put one on N Street
L6	and I don't have any problem with that. That is the
L7	northern entrance to the stadium along Half Street.
L8	But that's my suggestion.
L9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So you're saying
20	no signage on South Capitol Street?
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Correct.
22	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Between N and M,
23	no signage.
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: For naming
25	opportunities. That's my point. I don't mind

cerebrating the fact that there's a ballpark here and
it represents the Washington Nationals, it's when it
becomes commercial signage along South Capitol Street,
I think is wrong.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask you
this Mr. Parsons and then I'll hear from Mr. Turnbull
and Mr. Jeffries. The size of the lettering, is that
an issue on South Capitol Street or just no signage?
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No signage. The
lettering size is facing the new South Capitol Street
Bridge, 17 foot high, I mean that's twice the height
of this ceiling. Well maybe not twice the height but
it's just enormous.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, did
you want to add to that?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just want to,
but as far you were saying originally that a Nationals
banner would be acceptable?
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh sure. I just
don't think South Capitol Street ought to have that.
As you're being introduced to the Capitol dome over to
the right is this signage potentially similar to
what's on the Verizon Center.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I could support

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't 3 necessarily agree with that. I think South Capitol 4 Street in relationship is a major thoroughfare. 5 think that it should be a proud venue and I don't think it would take anything away from the Capitol, 6 7 but I don't agree with that. I think if I was doing something of this nature, this is where I would want 8 it to be prominent, I would want it to be seen. 9 10 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I know you do. 11 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You're looking at 12 But anyway I just don't agree with me all puzzled. 13 Mr. Parsons' comments. 14 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: What. T'm 15 suggesting is we give them one shot and that's it, Mr. Turnbull has in his hand, that's where they can put 16 their image. But not 17 foot high, 6 foot high. 17 18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So if I'm 19 riding down -- help me with this. If I'm riding down South Capitol Street, how high will it have to take 20 21 for me -- I'll be able to see it? 22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh you bet. 23 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: 24 That's what I'm

saying, one is enough.

25

1

that.

1 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So going south to 2 What if I'm coming the other way? north. 3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh you're not 4 going to see it. I mean you're going to see this I 5 think fine architecture but it's just going to have any --6 7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I'm visiting, I don't know what this is over here to the left. 8 9 don't know. I'm just asking. 10 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It's going to say 11 The Washington Nationals. It's just not going to say the name of the sponsor. 12 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: When I'm looking 13 14 for the Verizon Center I'm not looking for The 15 Washington Nationals. I'm just throwing that out there, you know. 16 Commissioner Jeffries, do you want to add 17 Coming from the other side. 18 to it? 19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, my only 20 comment is I mean this is a baseball stadium and it has to do what it has to do, particularly around 21 22 signage, and so while I'm sympathetic as it relates to 23 how we deal with signage along South Capitol, I guess 24 I would not want to somehow, you know, harm as it 25 relates to being able to identify the stadium through

1 some sort of signage. 2 I know that wasn't much of a response 3 really but I guess what I'm saying is that I mean I'd 4 like to sort of leave that somewhat to those who 5 create baseball stadiums and I would not want the Commission to have too much direction around some of 6 7 the placement of the naming rights. 8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. Sounds 9 like we have two here so I'm going to ask how can we 10 come to some agreement, because we need three. 11 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: We do. 12 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. What are 13 you requesting Commissioner Parsons, because I stepped 14 away for minute, what are you looking for along South 15 Capitol as it relates to naming? I'm just saying it 16 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: 17 should not contain signs which are naming rights 18 signs, no commercial signs in other words. If it 19 wants to say The Washington Nationals, as it does in 20 this diagram, I think that's great. But no matter 21 what the name of the stadium is, people are going to find it. 22 I mean is there any confusion about Kennedy 23 People get there and it doesn't even say Stadium? 24 Kennedy Stadium on it.

South

think

But

I

25

Street,

Capitol

1	commercial advertising on it is wrong. You don't
2	have it on Pennsylvania Avenue.
3	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So you don't have
4	a problem with The Washington Nationals being there,
5	but if there's any type of like Cingular Wireless or
6	whatever who's partly underwriting the stadium, you
7	don't want all those names along South Capitol?
8	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That's my point.
9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But isn't that
10	the going thing? Isn't that the reason they do that?
11	That's the reason Verizon comes in and wants to do
12	that.
13	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But how many times
14	do they need to do it is my point. So I'm going to
15	compromise with one.
16	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: One sign on South
17	Capitol?
18	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And one on N
19	Street to the north.
20	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Maybe the signage
21	could be subdued signage at ground level or something.
22	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask this
23	question first. Is this something that we really need
24	to deal with because if you put a motion and I assume
25	you're thinking out loud, but if you put a motion on

1 the table it's going to fail. 2 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Are you sure? Going by what I'm 3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: hearing now. I've sat up here and other things have 4 5 happened but I think if you put a motion on the table, put a motion --6 7 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay but wait a 8 minute. Time out. But I am a little concerned, I 9 mean something that Commissioner Parsons just said 10 that would concern me. Oftentimes it's how you couch 11 the stuff. I mean I don't want a whole bunch of neon 12 signs and things of that sort along South Capitol for 13 Obviously there needs to be some level of certain. 14 guidelines as it relates to how we place them. 15 But are we charged with, you know, voting this? 16 17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No, I'm bringing 18 it up but there's another one too, and you won't like 19 that either, I'm going to try that. I move that there should be no more than 20 21 two principal external naming rights signs, one sign 22 be mounted approximately 62 feet above 23 Potomac, the entrance on Potomac Avenue, 24 lettering no more than 6 feet high; a second sign may

be located on the M Street entrance just above the

1	turnstile canopy approximately 20 feet above the
2	plaza.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved.
4	Do I hear a second?
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would second
6	it but I think I need some more clarification. So I
7	don't know if you want
8	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do you want to
9	table it?
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I want to table
11	it.
12	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I don't think we
13	can table it, I think this is it.
14	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do you really
15	want to second it or would you like to
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Not as it is
17	stated right now.
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we just
19	have a motion on the table and you withdrew your
20	second. And if I'm not parliamentarily correct I'm
21	sure Mr. Bergstein will correct me.
22	MR. BERGSTEIN: There's no motion on the
23	table.
24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. It dies
25	for lack of a second, which I figured out about ten

1 minutes ago. Let's finish the discussion. 2 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm 3 curious and has the Office of Planning taken a look at 4 signage naming rights along South Capitol? 5 MR. LAWSON: Well, in the drawings that have been submitted so far the drawings haven't shown 6 7 signage for team naming rights along There would be certainly signage on South 8 Capitol associated with the entrances to the stadium 9 10 and I think some of the drawings show certainly 11 Nationals' banners and things like that. 12 But at least the drawings that I've seen 13 so far the naming rights signs are the two that were 14 pointed out by Commissioner Parsons, the one on 15 Potomac Avenue and the one on N Street. So do you have COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 16 17 Should we have guidelines as it relates to concerns? 18 how we deal with the naming rights along South 19 Capitol? 20 Certainly one of MR. LAWSON: the 21 quidelines that exists in the Capitol area overlay is 22 for the Commission to look at signage in general. 23 think that the signage locations that have been 24 proposed by the applicant and seem to be generally 25 supported are good locations for the signage and if

1 the applicant at some point wished to provide, I guess, additional naming rights signs for whatever 2 3 reason on either First or South Capitol, they'd always 4 have the option of coming back and requesting, you 5 know, permission to do that. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: My point is in the 6 7 record is a diagram that shows one, two, three, four, 8 five, six naming rights signs. And if we don't say 9 anything, this is approved. Right? 10 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But you have two 11 that are currently —-12 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm suggesting we 13 approve two not seven. 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Could we approve 15 the two with the option that for any others, the applicant has to come back and request approval for 16 any additional? 17 18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I like that. Т 19 like that, and that way we don't close the door. 20 you reword your motion to incorporate that language? 21 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I move that 22 we approve two principal external naming rights signs, one sign being mounted to approximately 62 feet above 23 the entrance, I'm using 62 feet because that's what's 24 25 in the record, on Potomac with lettering no more than

1	6 feet high. A second sign may be located on N	
2	Street entrance just above the turnstile canopy	
3	approximately 20 feet above the plaza, and that any	
4	further signs that the applicant wishes to erect,	
5	further naming rights signs that the applicant chooses	
6	to erect, will be brought back before the Commission	
7	for approval.	
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would second	
9	that.	
10	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's moved and	
11	properly second. All those in favor?	
12	(Ayes.)	
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?	
14	So ordered. Staff would you record the vote.	
15	MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the	
16	vote 4-0-1 to approve the signage as stated by	
17	Commissioner Parsons. Commissioner Parsons making the	
18	motion, Commissioner Turnbull second, Commissioners	
19	Jeffries and Hood in favor, Commissioner not present	
20	and not voting.	
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Chairman, I'm	
22	testing your patience but let me try something else	
23	here. You may recall at the hearing I had asked for	
24	a response to the RiverKeepers points. And I was	
25	somewhat pleased with that but also disappointed, so	

1 I really think it's worth the effort to try to insist 2 that green roofs be placed on portions of 3 building. 4 The response we got is we'll try if we 5 have the money, and I just don't think that's enough. I think of all the public buildings that I can think 6 7 of in this city or any other, the place to display green roofs is where people can really see them, and 8 9 here they can. They can see them on top of the 10 restaurant, they can see them on top of the building 11 next to the scoreboard, they can see them on the 12 retail. 13 So I would move that we require green 14 roofs on the restaurant, the unnamed building that's 15 to the north of the scoreboard, I'm looking at sheet A4 just because we had it out before. And the retail 16 17 that we've approved, or the option to retail that 18 approved tonight. we've here 19 20 Was it not clear that was a motion? 21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is there a 22 second? 23 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'll second that. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: 24 Thank you Mr. 25 Turnbull.

1	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I actually asked
2	for it lightly because I was hoping there wasn't one.
3	But let me ask a question. Mr. Bergstein, legally
4	that was proffered or mentioned. They said they would
5	try. Can we actually make a motion, Mr. Bergstein,
6	and actually require them to do that when the
7	applicant has not proposed to actually do it, they
8	said they would try. Can we actually do that
9	legally?
10	MR. BERGSTEIN: I think you'd have to
11	look at the standard that you have before you. I
12	believe in 1606.19 talks about the requirement that
13	they use environmentally friendly measures. I think
14	that if you don't feel that they've gone far enough
15	then you could require what Mr. Parsons is suggesting.
16	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And that's
17	1606.19. Can you take me right to it. I'm still
18	looking for it. Meanwhile, any other comments?
19	Anybody else want to comment on that? It's been moved
20	and properly second.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess I would
22	just comment on Mr. Parsons' I think what he's
23	trying to do is trying to up the ante and really get
24	something for not only baseball goers there but for
25	the city in the way that we're moving with green roofs

1 and be environmentally-friendly and creating an urban 2 environment that is something that you really want to 3 be excited about. 4 I think that the green roofs at the 5 ballpark would be a fantastic and encouraging thing for everyone. I really support it. 6 I think it's a 7 wonderful idea. 8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Go ahead. 9 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, but you know, Commissioner Turnbull, this is the 11th hour and 10 11 the weight of the stadium is getting just a bit much. 12 I think there's so many different issues that are on the table as it relates to the stadium. 13 14 I do think there are a number of amenities 15 that are being offered to the District as it relates to a baseball stadium. I don't want this Commission 16 17 to sort of pile it on, and that's not to minimize the importance of green roofs, but I'm just concerned 18 19 the timing and I'm just concerned 20 everything that is ahead of the applicant as 21 relates to this very ambitious program. 22 We should perhaps have talked about this a little sooner so that it could have been more 23

comfortably integrated, there could have been some

time for the applicant to logically and comfortably

24

25

1	absorb this. And I'm not in favor of sort of this
2	last minute insertion.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I would
4	associate my comments with Commissioner Jeffries. I
5	was trying to do the same thing with it previously but
6	it doesn't look like I need to, so if someone wants to
7	make a motion they can. And if not
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's already been
9	moved and second.
10	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been
11	moved and second. All those in favor?
12	(Ayes.)
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Opposition?
14	Opposed?
15	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Opposed.
16	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So ordered.
17	Staff would you record the vote.
18	MRS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record
19	the vote 2-2-1. The motion fails to provide for green
20	roofs. That was Commissioner Parsons moving,
21	Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood
22	and Jeffries opposed and Commissioner Mitten not
23	present and not voting.
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Chairman, I
25	would move that this Commission urge the applicant to

1	include green roofs on the restaurant, the building
2	adjacent to the scoreboard and retail.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I can go with
4	that. I'll second that. Any further discussion? You
5	said urge?
6	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Urge.
7	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Urge. I can
8	agree with that. It's been moved and seconded. Any
9	further discussion? All those in favor?
10	(Ayes.)
11	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?
12	So ordered. Staff would you record the vote.
13	MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the
14	vote 4-0-1 to urge the applicant to provide green
15	roofs on the restaurant, the building to the north of
16	the scoreboard and the option to retail that was
17	approved earlier. Commissioner Parsons moving,
18	Commissioner Hood seconding, Commissioners Turnbull
19	and Jeffries in favor, Commissioner Mitten not present
20	and not voting.
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr.
22	Turnbull, go ahead.
23	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr.
24	Chairman. I was going back to the most recent Office
25	of Planning report of July 5 th on page 4 where Office

1 of Planning has noted their concern about the loading 2 facilities. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 3 That's dated the 19th? 4 July 5th. The 5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 6 most recent one. 7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. 8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And they raised 9 their concerns about the loading facilities and their 10 concerns and DDOT's concerns about pedestrian 11 vehicular conflicts. They wanted to reduce the amount 12 of facade area devoted to loading bay doors. And they 13 might want to comment more upon it. I think it's very 14 valuable. 15 Thank you, Commissioner MR. LAWSON: I think first of all I'd like to point out 16 Turnbull. 17 that the applicant has addressed some of these 18 concerns for sure. They've minimized, they've reduced 19 the number of parking bays entering onto First Street. 20 Through the ballpark design especially they've reduced 21 the number of loading bays significantly. 22 We would obviously like to see 23 reduced even further. We note that the MOU agreement 24 between the applicant and DDOT includes a review of 25 parking and loading and access onto the site

1	general to ensure that it's provided in a safe and
2	convenient way. And we're comfortable with leaving
3	this issue for the applicant and DDOT to work out as
4	part of their overall transportation management
5	program.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULLL: I would like to
7	make a motion that we encourage the applicant
8	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You want to
9	encourage.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm just
11	concerned and again I don't want to be sounding like
12	we're dumping on anybody but I think it's a very valid
13	concern. And I'd like to encourage them to
14	significantly look at this plan and to work with the
15	Office of Planning and DDOT to resolve some of the
16	issues.
17	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We have a
18	motion.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second.
20	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Moved and second.
21	All those in favor?
22	(Ayes.)
23	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?
24	So ordered. Anything else
25	MRS. SCHELLIN: If I could record that

1	vote please.
2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh I'm sorry.
3	Staff will record.
4	MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the
5	vote 4-0-1 to encourage the applicant to look at the
6	plan and work with the Office of Planning and DDOT
7	regarding the issues that they have. Commissioner
8	Turnbull moving, Commissioner Parsons seconding,
9	Commissioners Hood and Jeffries in favor, Commissioner
10	Mitten not present and not voting.
11	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.
12	Commissioner Jeffries?
13	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. I just
14	wanted to make it clear that, assuming the applicant
15	is in earshot here, that previously the Commission
16	approved the retail Option 2, that Option 2 retail
17	plan as sort of an enhancement of Option 1. I mean
18	there is some level of connection but I just wanted to
19	make certain that the applicant is clear that the
20	Commission is looking at Option 2 as an enhancement of
21	Option 1.
22	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
23	Mr. Bergstein, do you think we've covered all the
24	relief and requirements?
25	MR. BERGSTEIN: I want to clarify a

1	little bit more what Mr. Jeffries said.
2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Go right
3	ahead.
4	MR. BERGSTEIN: And that was the
5	applicant, and this is what I need to hear the
6	Commission agrees with this, that the applicant may
7	not proceed with Option 1 alone. That it may only
8	proceed with Option 1 as enhanced by the retail
9	component of Option 2, that's what you've decided.
10	Originally the applicant asked for
11	flexibility to do Option 1 and if the money was
12	available to proceed with Option 2. What I understood
13	Mr. Jeffries to say your vote earlier reflected was
14	that alternative is not available to the applicant,
15	that they can only proceed with the amount of retail
16	that's called for in Option 2.
17	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Correct.
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think that's
19	how the vote was and I think I'm recorded as voting
20	against that. Hopefully. Okay. With that Mr.
21	Bergstein
22	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Chairman, it
23	just dawned on me that by necessity what we've done is
24	to go through and deal with specifics and haven't said
25	a thing about the project. And I want to

1	congratulate the architect not only for the ballpark,
2	I think it's going to be very handsome and very well
3	thought through and I've dropped my opposition to your
4	administration building Bill, I shouldn't personalize
5	it, but the administration building. I was persuaded
6	that we should do that.
7	And the housing is very exciting. I think
8	it's just going to be terrific and I just wanted to
9	say something maybe more positive than we have said
10	all night. Thank you.
11	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other
12	colleagues want to say anything? I would just add I
13	want to thank everyone for all of my colleagues,
14	Office of Planning, the Office of the Attorney General
15	and also the officers on the staff for their
16	assistance in helping us move forward.
17	And I want too to also commend the
18	applicant and his team for what they've done. And, as
19	the Mayor said when he testified, we are where we're
20	are. So hopefully we can move forward and hopefully
21	things will work out.
22	This Special Public Meeting is adjourned.
23	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
24	off the record at 7:20 p.m.)
25	

1

2